

THE CAUCASIAN

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY.

BY THE CAUCASIAN PUBLISHING CO.
MANAGING EDITOR: H. A. AYER.
BUSINESS MANAGER: H. C. RIVERS.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.
ONE YEAR, \$1.00
SIX MONTHS, .50
THREE MONTHS, .25

Entered in the Post Office at Raleigh, N. C., as Second Class Matter.

The Peoples Party Nominees.

NATIONAL TICKET.
FOR PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN,
OF Nebraska.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
THOMAS E. WATSON,
OF Georgia.

STATE TICKET.
FOR GOVERNOR,
W. A. GUTHRIE.
FOR LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR,
O. H. DUCKREY.

FOR SECRETARY OF STATE,
CYRUS THOMPSON.
FOR TREASURER,
W. H. WORTH.

FOR AUDITOR,
H. A. AYER.
FOR Supt. of Public Instruction,
CHAS. H. MEBANE.

FOR ATTORNEY GENERAL,
(To be named by State Committee.)
FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF SUPREME COURT,
WALTER MONTGOMERY.

FOR ELEC. AT LARGE,
Locke Craig, of Buncombe (Democrat).

R. B. Davis, of New Hanover (Populist).

First District—Theo. F. White, of Perquimans (Populist).

Second District—H. F. Freeman, of Wilson (Populist).

Third District—C. R. Thomas, of Currituck (Democrat).

Fourth District—W. S. Bailey, of Nash (Populist).

Fifth District—William Merritt, of Person (Populist).

Sixth District—B. F. Keith, of New Hanover (Silver Party).

Seventh District—Thos. F. Klutz, of Rowan (Democrat).

Eighth District—Tyre York, of Wilkes (Democrat).

Ninth District—R. D. Gilmer, of Haywood (Democrat).

CONGRESSIONAL TICKET.
1st District—HARRY SKINNER, of Pitt county.

2nd District—D. S. Moss, of Halifax county.

3rd District—JOHN E. FOWLER, of Sampson county.

4th District—W. F. STROWD, of Orange county.

5th District—A. J. DALBY, of Greenville county.

6th District—CHAS. R. MARTIN, of Anson county.

7th District—A. C. SHUFORD, of Catawba county.

8th District—R. Z. LINNEY, of Alexander county.

DON'T RETALIATE.

Nearly, if not quite half the Democratic papers in the State are roundly denouncing the electoral co-operation recently entered into by and between the Populist and Democratic State committees. Some papers, notably the Charlotte Observer, are carrying only the Democratic part of the electoral ticket at their mastheads, and are boldly advising Democrats to support only the Democratic part of the ticket. In addition to this, some Democratic leaders are advising the same procedure.

Well, they must be allowed to take their course. It may be as well for them to show their hand now as at any other time. As the time approaches for the final choice, it will be seen that a large number of these "leaders" and papers are goldbugs in disguise. We have known and preached this fact for four years, but it has been no easy task to evolve such conditions as would make it ridiculous to dispute our assertions along this line. We have been called a crank, fool, anarchist and several other choice names for venturing to state some living facts before these facts became apparent to party-blinded and careless individuals.

But we knew it all in 1892 when we decided we would go with them no longer. It was a sin—a heinous crime to break away from the "sacred" Democratic party then. Scandalous abuse and showers of rotten eggs was the punishment for our crime. We declared we were not having the principles of Democracy then, but that the Democratic party was leaving us. Now when that party declares that it has repented—has purged itself of its iniquities and has come back to where it left us, these Democratic papers and "leaders" refuse to come all the way with it; or they say if they do come back they must be permitted to push us from the ground we have held ever since they have been gone and take possession of everything as they had it before. We will not consent to these terms of reconciliation, for we are of the opinion that if this element of the Democratic party should once more come into full possession, they would become sassy again and not leave us ground enough to stand on.

Well, so be it, but while these facts appear, we must not be blamed for being a little careful as to how we place our trust. As long as this element stays with the Democratic party, it is the same old party, despite its assertions that it has purged itself. We do not know whether this element or the repenting element will ultimately control the party, but we

think that the chances are in favor of the disguised goldbugs. We do not intend to be harsh or unpleasant in these utterances, but we want it understood that we have no confidence in men or papers who will profess to advocate the cause of financial reform and the election of Bryan and at the same time refuse to adopt those methods which lead to the surest chances of securing both. "Goldbug in disguise" is the gentlest name we have for this element of the Democratic party.

While we think this element will again ultimately control the Democratic party, if that party lives, we do not think it represents the sentiments and wishes of the great majority of the voters in the party now. And hence we hope that Populists will pay no serious attention to the advice of these "goldbugs in disguise." We would earnestly plead that Populists do not permit themselves to be annoyed or incensed by what they advise or say. Do not, oh! do not be so small—so inconsiderate—so foolish as to try to retaliate by saying if these Democratic papers advise Democrats to scratch the names of Populists off the ticket, it is the duty of Populists to scratch the names of Democrats off the ticket. Such a course as this will throw us headlong into one of the most subtle traps ever set by goldbugs. It would lead to a goldbug victory in this State. Just think a moment, and you will see what a cute scheme and deep laid plan these "goldbugs in disguise" are trying to carry out. Will you be caught by it? We hope not. Let us have sense enough to avoid this snare and courage enough to condemn it.

AND THEY HAVEN'T ANSWERED YET.

We asked a question last week of our Democratic "friends," and as to that question they have preserved a silence thick enough and dense enough to be cut into solid blocks. It was a question that puzzled them—just like any question that touches upon the vital issues of the day puzzles them. They stand as dumb as a sheep before the shearer. Let us ask that question again.

Why is it that Democrats, who are now even surpassing (if possible) Populists in making "Populist" speeches, and who are out doing the ONLY ORIGINAL SILVER MAN in declaring for free silver—why is it, we ask, that these Democrats meet in districts now represented in Congress by Populists who are known to favor silver, and put up "free silver" Democrats against these free silver Populists? Do these Democrats hope to split the silver vote by this sort of proceeding, and thus insure the election of goldbugs from these districts? Do they not know that the Peoples party is the only party of record favoring this issue, and do they not know that the cause of silver is absolutely safe with a Populist, when the clearest record made shows that the cause of silver HAS NOT BEEN SAFE WITH DEMOCRATS.

What then can be the purpose of these "free silver" Democrats in trying to defeat these Populists who are already in Congress? Can they, will they give a satisfactory answer to this question? Democrats, tell us that the variety of "free silverism" which seems to be manifested by your proceedings is the very kind of "free silverism" that the Populists will oppose and fight now and forever. You may howl yourselves hoarse and "cuss" yourselves black in the face about the methods by which we will fight it, but we WILL FIGHT ON just the same.

Just survey the situation a moment. Just consider how ridiculously you are acting by lustily hailing for silver while you are trying to drive from Congress free silver men whose record is unimpeachable and whose future purpose is unquestionable! Indeed, you are trying to defeat six men whose records on the silver question are as good as any record you can show, for as a matter of fact Pearson and Linney can compare favorably with you on this issue. And their attitude as to the future is as good, if not better, than any you can assume on the strength of past records. Yes, while you are trying to defeat these four or six men, the Republicans of the State are helping the Peoples party to elect five silver Populists to Congress from this State.

Now, aren't you a beautiful mess? You are silver men up to the hub aren't you? Well, we guess! (not!!) You are showing your paralyzingly overpowering devotion to silver by trying to splutter out some disgusting drive over the fact that Populists venture to nominate their own men in two or three other districts where Democratic nominations are made. It is perfectly proper, is it, for you to fight Populists everywhere, but it is unrighteous and unholy for Populists to fight Democrats anywhere! Well continue to believe it if you will. All it will cost you is a smashing defeat in November, when you will find that you haven't a single representative in Congress. If you don't believe this last statement, all that we have to say is that your unbelief will not cost us anything.

The dictates of common sense, all the power of logic and the full force of reason combine to persuade the Populists that, under existing circumstances, the Republican party of

North Carolina is far more friendly to the cause of silver than the Democratic party is, and as long as this appears to be so, it will be our purpose to stand by our Republican friends on this silver issue and trust them in preference to trusting Democrats who show no hesitation in trying to defeat the most reliable silver forces that ever went to Congress from this State. Now, you have it flatly and plainly. Bring out your pop-pants and let them pop.

THEIR ONLY HOPE FOR MCKINLEY.

Now since the joint electoral ticket has been arranged in this State the silver men have a chance to unite their votes and defeat the goldbugs.

There is but one hope left for McKinley and the gold men, and that is for the voters who oppose the gold standard to fail to support the joint electoral ticket. The Charlotte Observer is quick to see and seize upon this opportunity to elect McKinley and defeat Bryan, though professing to support him. The following is its editorial advice to its readers, under date of September 23rd:

"Men whose boast is that they have never scratched the Democratic ticket and never voted against a Democratic nominee, cannot afford this year to vote for a Populist elector who will vote for a Populist for vice-president against the Democratic nominee. It is their duty to scratch the name of every Populist from the electoral ticket and vote only for those men who will vote for the Democratic candidates. In so doing it cannot be said that they are scratching a Democratic ticket, for it cannot be claimed that this hybrid affair is one."

Now what could please Mark Hanna and the gold-bugs better than this. Democrats to scratch Populist electors and Populists to scratch Democratic electors. If enough of this is done, of course, the McKinley electors will be elected. This is what the Observer's advice would lead to. Is that what the Observer desires?

If any so-called Democrats want to scratch Populist electors let him do it. He will simply prove that he is an agent of McKinley in disguise. But Populists are not made of that kind of stuff. Everyone will vote the joint electoral ticket, because everyone wants the defeat of the McKinley electoral ticket.

The Charlotte Observer has now found a chance to elect McKinley, but no Populist will become a partner of the Observer in its goldbug scheme.

HOW MANY "SUCKERS" ARE THERE IN NORTH CAROLINA?

The Washington Post sizes up the meaning and purpose of the bolting goldbug Democratic ticket. It says:

"As everybody knows, the object of the Indianapolis convention was, and the purpose of the men of whom it was composed, and all of whom they represented, is to beat Bryan and the Democracy in the only possible way, to wit, by aiding in the election of McKinley and the restoration of the Republican party to execute the control of the government. After mature deliberation and anxious consultation with the leading bolters, it was decided that the putting of another ticket in the field would more effectively promote the success of the Republican party, more helpfully contribute to the defeat of the Democracy than for those leaders to go boldly on to the aid of McKinley and call on disaffected Democrats to follow them. But it is the clearly understood policy of the Palmer and Buckner management to encourage voting directly for McKinley. The use of the Indianapolis ticket is to catch such voters as will not go over and might vote for Bryan if the choice between him and McKinley were presented."

As a matter of course, the Indianapolis convention was bound to put a good deal of old-fashioned Democracy in its platform. It had to keep up a pretense of opposition to Republican doctrine, and all the delegates were well aware that the way to help the Republicans most was to seem to desire to hurt them. In accordance with this plan, the Indianapolis platform was enriched with an old time Democratic tariff plank. The Republican organs, fully appreciating the peculiar situation of the bolters, are making no attacks on their tariff plank or anything else in the declaration of faith. Sweet peace reigns between them."

Every gold Democratic (every man who will be benefited by the gold standard) will vote for McKinley. This Palmer and Buckner ticket was put up to catch the votes of the "suckers" who have been fooled by the gold Democrats. How many suckers are there in North Carolina?

SPEAK OUT, MR. MCKINLEY.

The following editorial appeared in the New York World (goldbug) under the date of September 25th. It praises Mr. Bryan's utterances upon trusts and monopolies, and asks Mr. McKinley to publicly express his views upon this question—which he has so far failed to do.

"We are delighted that Mr. Bryan is now following our advice of over two months ago. For instance, in his Brooklyn speech he said:

"I know why these men are afraid to have the Chicago ticket elected. It is because these great trusts, these great corporations, the great combinations of wealth—are enjoying unjust privileges. They know that the Attorney-General whom I will appoint, if elected, will not stand there to defend the great corporations when they ought to be broken up."

But Mr. McKinley will do well to give Mr. Bryan's words on this subject the most serious attention. He will do well to recognize the perfectly patent fact that silence on this subject is not golden. He will do well to recognize that this subject is in the minds of millions of honest people, not only Democrats but Republicans also. He will do well to remember that hundreds of thousands of Democrats may vote for Mr. Bryan not on account of but in spite of his free silver fallacies, and will vote against himself not on account of but in spite of his honest money

championship, if his silence gives seeming consent to the charges that are being made against his trusts and Wall Street syndicates.

Is he?

There is no doubt that had Mr. Bryan and the Chicago platform made this the burning issue from the heart, instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

There is no doubt that he can get this "sweeping and impressive majority" for which he asks, only by drawing to his support these hundreds of thousands of hesitating voters.

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

What do you think, Mr. McKinley, about trusts and monopolies? What do you think about Wall Street syndicates and the encroachments of corporate greed? What do you think of the perversion of laws for private gain? Instead of sacrificing everything to free silver, Mr. Bryan could have swept the country. There is no doubt, as Mr. McKinley himself says, that to bury this free silver heresy forever it is necessary to have "not a bare majority, but a mighty anything short of that will leave the question further dispute."

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER.

Railroads in Politics—Are Forcing The Issue—Their Corrupt Influence in Legislation.

BRYAN EAST; WATSON WEST.

The Former's Wonderful Endorsement—Brilliant Campaign Speeches—Watson in the West Winning Votes and Making Most Favorable Impression—A True Friend of the Laboring Classes—Mayor Strong, of New York, Little Game to Threaten Mr. Bryan From Speaking in That City.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Sept. 26.—The great national campaign is now nearing the point where the hardest and most decisive fighting begins. Presidential campaigns are made, are won or lost during the month of October. It is clear that Bryan has the people with him now. Nothing but the expenditure of an immense amount of money or some unforeseen turn of affairs can defeat him. Yet, everything is still in doubt.

The Literature Bureau of the national Democratic committee has been removed to Chicago. They learned that they could get out plates for weekly newspapers and documents cheaper from that point.

THE RAILROADS FORCING THE ISSUE.

Your correspondent learns at Peoples Party headquarters that they have made demands for the folder entitled "The Wage Earner and Free Silver" than for any other document which they publish. Local committees are ordering these folders, and are placing

